

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

## COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

## COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 4, 2021, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

## PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Amanda Hoffman, a legislative fellow on my staff, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the 117th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m., Thursday, August 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 3684.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator PORTMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

## INVEST IN AMERICA ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for allowing

me to say a few words tonight, and I want to commend him and the Republican Leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, for allowing us to have this series of amendments.

The Senate has worked its will and will continue to work its will tomorrow. As was said, there have been 22 amendments on the floor. About half of them are Democratic amendments, and about half of them are Republican amendments.

I will say, also, there has just been a lot of discussion that has ensued because of this amendment process. So a lot of people have had the opportunity to discuss their issues to try to improve the bill in certain ways, and, frankly, a lot of these amendments were accepted; they were voted on positively—well, one just recently with regard to a safety issue that was just discussed—and improve the bill. So that is the way this place ought to work, and I think it is consistent with what we tried to do in this process from the beginning, where we saw an opportunity to pull out core infrastructure from a much larger package and deal with it without raising taxes but by focusing on bipartisan solutions, and that is exactly what the underlying bill does.

The next step in that, then, was to say: Let's try to have an open amendment process too. And sure enough, we have.

I had some colleagues of mine come up to me tonight and say: You know, it is nice to see the Senate working its will again, because these are colleagues who were around in previous decades where, you know, they saw this more often.

So, again, I want to thank my colleagues for going through this process. It requires some patience. It requires some consensus. Some amendments had to be altered in some ways to be sure that both sides were comfortable having votes on them. But at the end of the day, we are able to say that people's voices are being heard.

This will continue tomorrow. I just saw a list of about 10 amendments, and I know there are others as well that people would like to offer tomorrow, and I am all for it, as is Senator SINEMA. Senator SINEMA and I are very pleased that Members have the opportunity to express themselves.

I also want to talk a little about what this bill does and why it is so important for our country.

For the past 2 days, we have been working through this amendment process, and sometimes we lose sight of the bigger picture here. The bigger picture is that we as a country have an infrastructure system that is badly in need of repair. We are consistently rated as a country with an infrastructure system that, frankly, hasn't kept up with the rest of the world.

There is a group called the World Economic Forum, and they give a report card every couple years, and America ends up, you know, 13th or 14th in the world in terms of infra-

structure. That is not where we want to be.

By the way, on a broader gauge of competitiveness, we are right up at the top in terms of our trade system, our tax system, our economic system generally, but with regard to infrastructure, we are not.

As some of you have heard me say before, this is about competitiveness too. Think about this: China spends three or four times more as a percentage of their GDP than we do on infrastructure. The reality, as I have looked at those numbers, is that it is even higher than that, but let's say three or four times higher. Why? Because they get it. They are trying to outcompete us in every way, including having better ports, better rail, better airports, and the ability to both buy and sell their products overseas, and we here in America want to be at the top of that list. That is why it is very important, from my point of view, that we focus on the economic impact here.

If we get this bill passed, it will make our economy more efficient; therefore, more productive; therefore, the economy will grow; therefore, more tax revenue will come into the coffers.

There has been a lot of discussion about the pay-fors in this legislation. We will know more as the CBO report tells us very specifically how it is paid for. But the bottom line is, much of what happens in this bill, which is spending for capital assets, this long-term spending—it is not going to be spent next year. It may be spent in 5 years or 10 years. It may be a bridge in Georgia. It may be a port in Alabama. Those take years and years and years. The funding we are providing, the \$550 billion in this bill, will be spent over that period of time. It will add to those hard assets. It is, as a result of that, on the supply side of the economy, creating jobs, creating hard assets, like the bridges and like the ports, and as a result of that, it is actually counter-inflationary.

I know there has been concern on the floor, including raised today in one of the amendments, about the fact that more spending leads to more inflation. Not this kind of spending. The kind of spending that would lead to it is more what is called the demand side of the equation—you know, as an example, the stimulus checks or even the unemployment insurance benefits. That led to more demand in the economy. Yes, that did drive up our inflation over the past several months and continues to. This is not that. This is spending over the long haul. It will create these capital assets that will make our economy more efficient and should be counter-inflationary.

We have a number of economists who have spoken to this: Doug Holtz-Eakin some of you know; also Michael Strain, who is at the American Enterprise Institute. The Penn Wharton study on this is very interesting. They say, actually, that our legislation, as they analyze it, will end up growing the

economy, creating more jobs, and actually reducing the deficit, meaning more money will come into the coffers than we are spending here that is not paid for with CBO-certified official scores because of the economic impact of this.

So this is very important for all of our constituents. It is also important for our broader economy, to make sure America stays at the forefront and that we can be competitive for our kids and our grandkids.

Let's take the State of Ohio as an example since I happen to be from Ohio and why it is going to help my State.

Ohio is a big infrastructure State. We have a lot of roads and a lot of bridges. Ohio's roadway network has a lot of congestion also. It is estimated that the congestion in Ohio costs motorists an estimated \$4.7 billion each year in lost time and wasted fuel. That is according to the American Society of Civil Engineers, which scored Ohio's roads at a D in their 2021 infrastructure report card—a D. Now, the Nation as a whole is only a C-minus under their analysis. Ohio is a D. So we are a little worse than the Nation as a whole. As a whole, again, we are falling behind but Ohio particularly.

We are second in the Nation for the number of bridges. We have got a lot of little rivers and railroad tracks in Ohio, so we have got a lot of bridges. We have 44,736 bridges in Ohio.

By the way, they have looked at these bridges. Their analysis is that nearly half of them are not in good condition.

Our farmers, who are working to plant crops in their fields, want to be able to then get those crops to market. They want to get them to the elevators. They want to be able to export them. They care about infrastructure.

The moms and dads across Ohio who commute to work every day would heck of a lot rather spend their time with their kids than sitting in a car in a traffic jam on, you know, I-71 or 75 or I-270 or I-70.

We have got a lot of great roads in Ohio, but, frankly, they can't keep up with the demand, so we have got a lot of traffic jams during rushing hour. Those are some of the people who care a lot about infrastructure.

Our manufacturers in Ohio—we make everything in Ohio. We make cars. We make washing machines. We make tanks. We are proud of what we make in Ohio and what we export all around the world. We have got to be sure to get those products to market, too, so infrastructure is really important.

Today, I talked to a company in Ohio that has trucks all over Ohio and the country, for that matter. It is the Cintas Corporation. They are the uniform company, but they do a lot more than uniforms. They are excited about this bill because it is going to help them be more efficient in their delivery of their services.

That is the same with our truckers. I talked to a trucking company person

yesterday who was interested in how this would affect the truckstops and wanted to know about, you know, electric vehicle charging stations and so on. But the bottom line was, this person said this is going to help because our truckers want to have a safe road and a safe bridge. They want to be able to meet their requirements and not get stuck in traffic jams and be able to make more money on the road, frankly.

So this is something that helps our constituents across the board. But it goes well beyond just our roads. This is also about water infrastructure in this legislation. Communities across our State deserve water infrastructure that is going to deliver them clean, safe drinking water. We have got a lot of old water systems in Ohio that need help and need it badly.

We also have a lot of wastewater systems in Ohio that are in trouble. Some of you may know this, but there are new EPA rules that have come out over the past couple decades about wastewater systems and particularly combined sewer overflow systems, where when you have a lot of rain, in many of our systems in Ohio, there is a combination of the sewer system and the wastewater system, and that is not safe. Yet fixing it is really expensive.

Those communities—mostly midsize cities in Ohio but some larger cities as well—have all said to me: Can you help us a little more on water infrastructure?

With the revolving loan program we have in here, the ability for them to get low-interest Federal loans to be able to expand their water infrastructure system—they will be able to do that in this legislation, as well as receive grants from the Federal Government to help them ensure that we do have water systems that work.

Folks in rural parts of our State—Ohio is an Appalachian State. We have about 32 counties considered part of Appalachia. And guess what. In most of those counties, we have virtually no internet. I mean, sometimes there is real slow internet you can get but virtually no internet. This is why, for some of our kids in those counties in Ohio—these are rural counties that don't have access to Wi-Fi of a speed that is appropriate for school, much less work.

These kids are falling behind, and particularly, of course, during the pandemic, when they had to rely on online learning. And the stories are out there, and you know them, and the mom that comes up to me when I am out and about in Ohio and says: You know what; I had to take my kid to the parking lot of the library, which is a 45-minute drive for me across rural Ohio roads, to be able to do her homework.

That makes no sense. We want the digital divide to be closed. We want the ability for those kids in rural Ohio to have access to the internet, just as kids can get access to it in suburban or more urban settings. But even in the

suburban and urban settings, we want to help be sure those kids have the hookup to their home to get that internet and to be able to afford that internet.

So this legislation is unprecedented in many ways in terms of infrastructure—more roads, more bridges, more ports, more water systems—but it is also historic, unprecedented in terms of the expansion of broadband, finally.

Again, this is about catching up. There are countries around the world that actually have better broadband than we do that are not even developed countries. They are poorer countries. You would think they might be a little behind, but they are sort of leapfrogging us in terms of technology because they realize how important having that internet build-out is.

The other issue is for telehealth. There are more and more people relying on telehealth. Part of this comes out of the pandemic, when people kind of had to do that. They didn't want to go into a doctor's office or hospital for fear of the COVID pandemic. And, frankly, right now with the variants—and the delta variant in particular—there are some people who are still now, unfortunately, not comfortable going into a healthcare setting, but they need to have an appointment. They need to have someone to check them out, and they need, perhaps, with regard to behavioral health, to have the ability to have a consult. They can do that online now, and the Federal government has been reimbursing that for the first time, because before, under Medicare and Medicaid, that was very difficult. So this is going to be a part of our system. It is a good thing, sort of a rare silver lining in a terrible dark cloud of the pandemic that we learned how to use telehealth better.

So what if you don't have access to internet? So what if you are a veteran in southeast Ohio and you have to drive 2½ hours to a VA clinic, and instead you would like to do telehealth because it makes a lot more sense for your situation, particularly during the pandemic, but you don't have internet? So, definitely, that is not fair. So telehealth is another reason for us to expand internet access.

Finally, just for our economic benefit in these communities, we want more startups. We want more companies to be able to be successful. Without the internet—let's face it—it is going to be very, very difficult. These are all part of this legislation as well.

The hard core infrastructure you think of—like roads and bridges, yes; water infrastructure, yes; ports, rail, freight—but also the digital infrastructure that ties our country together—that is part of this legislation as well.

Again, it is why economists who look at this say this is actually going to help make our economy work better, make it more efficient. We will be more productive as a country, and we will have more economic growth and then more revenue will come in. That is why this is so popular.

I mean, when you think about it, what can everybody agree on in America today? Not much. We are a country that is more divided, and that saddens me. It concerns me, particularly as we face challenges, some of which, like the pandemic, are here domestically, and some of which are global challenges brought on by some of our adversaries, like Russia or China or North Korea or Iran. But we are divided as a country. One thing that brings us together is our military. I think most people acknowledge and respect the role that our military plays. And another is infrastructure. It is an issue where traditionally Republicans and Democrats were able to come together and say: We may disagree on taxes and healthcare and all sorts of other things, but on this issue of strong infrastructure, we can come together.

Again, I think it makes sense economically, and, also, it is popular. People know when they are driving over potholes or getting stuck in traffic jams or not being able to get a product because the ports are backed up, which they are right now. Our ports are inefficient and people literally can't get products. They can't get cars or they can't get an electronic device. That is all part of this. So this is something that ought to bring us together, and it does bring us together.

The polling out there shows this, by the way. There are two polls in the last few months that both said that 87 percent of the American people want us to work on this infrastructure project on a bipartisan process and get it done. Those numbers were unbelievable, and it was exactly 87 percent in both polls, interestingly, even though one was CBS and one was CNBC.

But forget the polls for a minute and just go home and talk to people. They do want to make sure that we are not raising taxes to do this. They don't want to see us helping the economy long-term with infrastructure but hurting the economy short-term with higher taxes. And I agree. And we don't do that here. That is what is particularly great about this approach. It is that we said that we are going to pull out core infrastructure only and we are not going to raise taxes.

So we have the funds in here to be able to help with regard to our highways, our bridges, our ports, our waterways, our broadband expansion. But we also have the ability for us to do that in a way that makes sense for all Americans.

In Ohio, it is going to help us do something else that is important, and that is to help with regard to some of our big infrastructure projects. I will talk about one tonight briefly—the Brent Spence Bridge. This is in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH. It is a critical bridge because it is where I-75 and I-71 come together, and therefore it is a bottleneck. Twice as many cars drive on that bridge every day as it was built for. Twice as many cars drive on that bridge every day—and trucks—as

it was built for. It is the reason that there is a traffic jam there during rush hour. But it is also the reason that it is unsafe, because over time the shoulders have been removed to create another lane. So if there is an accident on that bridge, there is nowhere to go. We had an accident 2 months ago with two trucks that collided, and we had to close it down, actually, for several weeks, and it was a mess.

And talk about the effect on the economy. Think about this. There are roughly 3 million people in the metropolitan area there, with Dayton and Cincinnati on one side, and the other side has about 1 million people in Covington, KY. And you have traffic going all the way north and south from Canada to Mexico, and all of a sudden you don't have a bridge available because of the safety concerns that led to the accident. So we need a solution with regard to that bridge, and we have been talking about it for years. For 25 years, I have been involved in the effort to try to find the funding to replace this bridge because it needs it. Finally, we will have the ability to do that. We will have the ability to help, with Kentucky and with Ohio and with the Federal Government working together with the local community, to complete this Brent Spence Bridge corridor project. Why? Because we are putting an unprecedented amount of money into not just bridges but bridges like this one—bridges that are major commercial bridges; bridges that are functionally obsolete, which ours have been for years; bridges that desperately need the help.

We also have a big aviation industry in Ohio. We support a lot of jobs through aviation, our second biggest industry after agriculture in Ohio. There is \$25 billion for new spending for airports in here. That is going to help airports build on the momentum that we need right now in Ohio to be able to expand our aerospace industry.

On the shores of Lake Erie, on the north coast of Ohio, we will also have help. Lake Erie supports fishing and tourism industries that total over \$10 billion. It provides drinking water for 10 million people.

It is the top tourist attraction in our State, but as anyone who visits the lake will tell you, they have some serious long-term health challenges with the lake. We have invasive species. We have a problem with toxic algal blooms. We have pollution. We have rising levels of the lake. This bill helps with regard to all of that. With regard to rising levels of the lake, there are communities on the lake that will tell you their water systems don't work because the lake water has risen to the point where the outtake valve which is next to the intake valve is now actually underwater, so the system doesn't work well. In fact, the system is incredibly expensive to replace. So this will help with regard to that.

As cochair of the Senate Great Lakes Caucus, I am very pleased to see this

investment because it will support the infrastructure and infrastructure investments in communities all along Lake Erie and every one of our Great Lakes.

Finally and crucially, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act before us helps more than 300,000 Ohio households that lack access to this high-speed internet. That is incredibly important. Our legislation does everything that I have talked about in terms of infrastructure, and that is important.

Again, we have the studies out there that I talked about, including one from Penn, from the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School. They talked about how the economic growth from this study will actually make our economy better and create more jobs, and they say that, actually, over time, it reduces the deficit, based on looking at our study and, specifically, our proposals. So all that is true.

The final thing I guess I want to say is that it goes beyond infrastructure. It goes to how to get Washington back to a point where Washington is solving problems for the American people. And this bill is not perfect for anybody—no Republican, no Democrat. Why? It is a bipartisan compromise.

You know, again, we started off with a product that President Biden introduced that was \$2.65 trillion—a huge package called “infrastructure,” but most of it was not for infrastructure. It had huge tax increases in it—the highest tax increase, it would have been, in American history. It would have made our country less competitive, in my view.

We said: OK, let's find a group of Democrats and Republicans, and let's agree to pull out the core parts of this, the core infrastructure, and find a way to pay for it without raising taxes. That is what we did, and we worked hard to create a product that was fair for everybody. But that means finding that consensus, and that is not easy.

You know, we all had to make concessions, but, at the end of the day, we got a product—\$550 billion over the next 5 years, which will be spread out, spent over many, many years, that will put America back on top in terms of infrastructure.

It will put us in a position where, for our kids and our grandkids, they are going to have a more productive and a more efficient economy—one that produces more, one that has the ability for America to say to the world: Look at us again. We are back. We are back. We now have an infrastructure system with our ports and our roads and our bridges, with our water infrastructure, and with our broadband that can be, once again, a model for the rest of the world and help move us forward and ensure that every American has the opportunity to succeed.

So this bipartisan process in and of itself, I think, is an accomplishment of this legislation. The underlying bill is what is most important, I suppose, but

just being able to show that Republicans and Democrats can come together in this town and get something done that is positive for our country, that in and of itself is an accomplishment.

With that, I yield the floor.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:36 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, August 5, 2021, at 10:30 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CHAVONDA J. JACOBS-YOUNG, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS, VICE CATHERINE E. WOTEKI.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN F. PLUMB, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE. (NEW POSITION)

### SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

JENNIFER CLYBURN REED, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION. (NEW POSITION)

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JAMIE L. HARPOOTLIAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA.

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### *To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. KARSTEN S. HECKL

### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### *To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. DAVID J. JULAZADEH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be colonel*

INGRID C. KAAT  
GENEVIEVE N. MINZYK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be lieutenant colonel*

ANGELICA HAWRYSIAC

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

KATHERINE A. ABBOTT  
RYAN T. ABRAHAM  
CHRISTABEL O. ALPHONSO  
JENNIFER C. ANDREWS  
EDRICK R. APONTE  
GABRIELLE A. ARAGON  
BREANDAN E. ARBUCKLE  
JENNIFER M. ARMENGUAL  
JENNIFER L. ARMON  
YVONNE ASHEY  
KENNETH NIIBONNEY ASHIANOR  
RACHAEL C. AUGER  
SALVADOR BALLESTEROS III  
CAROLYN M. BATTE  
NICOLE O. BELL  
JASON CHARLES BENCHICH  
MARSHA N. BENNETT  
DAVID E. BOECKX  
SATJAI BOONMEE

NICHOLAS S. BOSIAK  
MONIQUE DESIREE BOWENS  
JOSHUA W. BOYLE  
PAMELA A. BRADSHAW  
JAMES H. BROWN  
DARREL G. CAC  
GENEVIEVE R. CANETE  
RACHEL GARCIA CASTILLO  
STEFANIE J. CELIS  
JILLEEN K. CHARETTE  
CATHY M. CHAVEZ  
JACQUELINE CINTRON  
DONELLE L. CLARK  
ANDREW JOSEPH COLBURN  
MELISSA J. CONNER  
MARIO D. COOPER  
SHANNON LEIGH COOPER  
PRIZMA G. CORELLA  
JOSEPH S. CRAIG  
LUKE R. CREASMAN  
ELIZABETH D. CROSBY  
WILLIAM W. CROSBY  
CHRISTOPHER M. DE LA LOZA  
LORENZ M. DE LEON  
TIFFANY LAUREN DEAN  
LADYLAARNI O. DOMINGO  
BRIAN E. DURANT  
JACKIE L. DUTSCHKE  
KATHLEEN QUILAO EBALO  
CONNIE MARI T. FERNANDEZ  
BRIANNA L. FISCUS  
JAMES S. FITE  
SHENIQUA D. FORTUNE  
AMANDA ATITYA FOX  
DARYLL ANDREW F. GARCIA  
TOMMY J. GARCIA  
MEGAN A. GEORGE  
SEANA L. GERALDELLESWORTH  
LACEY R. GIBSON  
SARAH Z. GILBERT  
GAVIN L. GLOOR  
JESSICA M. HENLEY  
LAURA A. HERRERA  
CAROLINE M. HILL  
MARY A. HOFFMAN  
BRITTANEY N. HOUSTON  
MATTHEW R. HUARD  
MICHAEL RYAN HUMPHREY  
CRYSTAL FRANSION JAMES  
TORI A. JARAMILLO  
TAUICA W. JOHNSON  
LAURA L. JOHNSTAD  
EVANGELINE JONES  
BRANDY JEAN JOY  
NOUFOH KAKAYE  
LAUREN G. KALANI  
NICOLE LOUISE KEATING  
MIGYOUNG KIM  
JESSICA ELIZABETH KNIZEL  
STEPHANIE J. KOMPOLTOWICZ  
TARYN D. KRIGBAUM  
NICOLE M. KRONEBUSCH  
RICHARD A. KURTZ  
RUPERT BACORA LACO  
JULIANNE LEGIERSE  
DAWN M. LEWIS  
MYRNA A. LIM  
PAOLO JESUS BAUTISTA LIWANAG  
CHRISTINA R. LYNCH  
STACY L. MADDEN  
CANDACE M. MASON  
MOHAMMAD MASUM  
RANDOLPH L. MATIAS  
SYLVIA R. MAY  
SACHA NASHEA MAYS  
RACHEL D. MAYSSONET  
CASSIDY D. MCEUEN  
PHILLIP R. MCFARLING  
MATILDAH A. MCHATTA  
MALINDA SUE MEUSE  
CANDACE L. MIDDLETON  
BRIAN K. MIMS  
LAQUITA M. MOORE  
DAWN M. MORALES  
ALICIA M. MYERS  
EMMANUELLE E. NAFZIGER  
MAUREEN NANYANGWE  
FLORIZEL M. NEGRILLO  
BROOKE M. NELSON  
JUSTINE R. NEVE  
LATOYA DENISE NOUWAMEY  
ERIKA M. NOVA  
ANGEL C. NWANKWO  
ADAM J. OLLIGSCHLAGER  
EMILY M. OFFER  
ROMANUS O. OTTENDE  
SAMANTHA J. PARHAM  
JEFFERY ADAM PATTERSON  
JORDAN D. PETERSEN  
ERIK D. PINTATI  
GLORIA J. RAPKIN  
ALANA N. RAYON  
JENNIFER A. REICHERT  
ADAM R. RENTZ  
SIMMONETTE C. REYES  
JON O. A. RIVERA  
JORGE ROMERO, JR.  
KRYSTL G. RUMEN  
KRISTA A. RUNCIE  
RHODA B. SANTOS  
CHADDA M. SATCHELL  
NICOLE TIFFANY SAVVIDIS  
AMANDA G. SCANLON  
ALICIA M. SCOTT  
MONICA L. SCOTT  
JOHN BRYAN S. SERRANO  
MARY R. SEVILLA

SHUNDONNA S. SHAW  
JAZMIN NICOLE SHAWELL  
CHRISTOPHER D. SHAWVER  
JESSICA DAWN SHEALEY  
SUSAN E. SHELTERS  
ALICIA D. SHEPHERD  
STEPHANIE N. SHIVERS  
TAJUANA TORRELL SHULER  
DANIELLE M. SILER  
CANDICE J. SMITH  
SYLVENNIE SHANTRELL SMITH  
NICOLE L. SPESARD LANGFIELD  
NATHAN A. SPRAGUE  
RICHARD W. STALEY  
ANDREW A. STEPHENS  
MARIA G. STOUGHTON  
ALANE J. SWAIN  
ERIC D. SWANSON  
RON L. TAGALICOD  
SHEANA TALLEY  
DANIEL V. TESCH  
STACY L. THOMAS  
MATHEW R. THOMPSON  
JAKE D. THUESON  
ERIC ALAN TITUS  
JOSE LUIS TORRES  
NICOLE E. TRAYLOR  
JOANNE G. TREMBLAY  
CHRISTELA MARIE TURNER  
SHELLA MAE UDAUND VALDEZ  
LAURA GARRETT VELASQUEZ  
VIRGIE T. VINCECRUZ  
FAYOLA D. WARD  
DARYL G. WELCH  
KAITLYN J. WHITE BATHOLD  
SETH RONALD WILLIAMS  
MEGHAN E. D. WITTEN  
RICHELE NEFF WITTMAN  
YUNG A. WONG  
BANNER LEE SUE ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

JON R. ALEXANDER  
LYUBOMIR B. ANGELOV  
SAMANTHA J. BROWN  
KEITH PATRICK BUEHLER  
OSCAR M. CASTRO  
MIN JUAN CHEN  
DEREK CHINN COLE  
CHRISTOPHER R. COTE  
COURTNEY R. DAIGLE  
DESHAWN B. DAVIS  
KRISTIN I. DRELL  
BENJAMIN E. FISCHL  
RUSLAN R. GARREY  
TILLI RAJ GHALE  
TAMIKO TOYAMA GHEEN  
THERESA C. HALL  
WILLIAM C. HARRIS III  
ASHLEY D. HENDRYX  
JOSHUA D. HOGELAND  
JOHN KELLY HOUSEMAN  
AUSTIN M. HOWARD  
MEGAN BROOKE HOWELL  
INDIRA MARGARITA INFANTE  
WILLIE F. JONES  
ALEXANDER K. KOCH  
ANNA D. LAIN  
BRANDON JAMES LONGSTREET  
CRISTINA LUCIA LUCERO  
LUIS A. MANRIQUE  
MEGAN LYNN MAXWELL  
TYLER DANIEL MAXWELL  
STEPHEN G. MINNIS  
AMANDA JEAN MONTGOMERY  
SIMON P. NG  
LINDAMIRA ARREYANY NKWENTI  
WINNIE A. ODHAMBO  
LARRY PHILLIP OTERO  
KATIE LYNN PANE  
KOLBY T. PARENT  
MARINA A. PETROVA  
CHRISTOPHER JAMES POPHAM  
LAWRENCE A. RICE  
ALEXANDREA VALERIE RICHARDS  
SARA ESTER SALMERI  
ANGELIQUE CHANTAL SANDERS  
AARON T. SMITH  
JEFFREY A. SMITH, JR.  
MATTHEW RICHARD SMITH  
MELVIN H. TSUI  
JOHN WILLIAM WENDELL  
BRANDON DAVID WILLIS  
INARA W. XIE  
SONYA RUTH YELBERT  
PETER H. YUSCKAT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be lieutenant colonel*

TIMOTHY JAMES ANDERSON  
JESSICA L. ANGELES  
NEIL ADAM BOOTS  
RODNEY PAUL BOTTOMS  
MICHAEL A. BOWER  
LIZETH CAMERON  
MELODIE M. GROSS  
AMANDA M. DAVIS  
SEAN M. FINNEY  
BOYD H. FRITZSCHE  
DANIEL J. GILARDI